v.46

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor : R. Palme Dutt

Labour Government Policy Problems

PROBLEMS & PERSPECTIVE

The Editor

★

INCOMES POLICY & THE UNIONS

J. E. Mortimer : P. Kerrigan

★

LABOUR GOVERNMENT & AFRICA

Jack Woddis

★

The United States Election : Dr. Aptheker

Smethwick—A Warning : H. Bourne

DECEMBER 1964

Two Shillings

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLVI No. 12 DECEMBER . 1964

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: Problems and Perspective. *Promise and Peril—Multilateral Menace—Chinese Atom Bomb and Nuclear Disarmament—Labour and M.L.F.—A New Political Climate—Bipartisan Deficit—Lost Warnings—Price of the Loot—Hiding the Truth—Wrong Diagnosis - Wrong Remedies—Budget and Incomes Policy—Two Alternative Roads*.....**R.P.D.** 529

Incomes Policy and the Unions. Leading trade unionist argues the case for a more equitable distribution of the nation's wealth **J. E. Mortimer** 543

Trade Unions and the Labour Government. An outline of the immediate problems affecting the trade unions.....**P. Kerrigan** 548

The United States Election. American Marxist sums up the results and the next steps for the U.S. labour movement..... **Dr. H. Aptheker** 554

The Labour Government and Africa. An estimation of the problems and opportunities facing the Labour Government..... **J. Woddis** 560

Smethwick: A Warning. A call to combat prejudice and discrimination ..... **H. Bourne** 566

Documents of the Month: A Damning Exposure. 559
Cairo Conference Declaration. 565

Illustration: The Voice of the Pioneers. 552-3

Book Reviews: 'Economics for Trade Unionists', Sam Aaronovitch: *H. Scanlon;* 'Clifford Allen', Arthur Marwick: *P.A.* 570

An Eventful Year..... .....**H. Falber** 572

Index. 573

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

PROBLEMS AND PERSPECTIVE

Cabinet after Cabinet all round Europe is seeking desperately to 'correct the balance' by restricting imports and encouraging exports by all means in its power. . . . Along that path lies ultimately the cessation of international trade and the bankruptcy of the world.

Economist, November 7, 1931.

November 10, 1964

Britain's problems cannot be separated from the international situation. We have not only entered new political conditions in Britain since the election. We are also approaching a new political situation in world relations. The massive defeat of Goldwaterism in the United States in November has reinforced the defeat of Toryism in Britain in October. In France the conditions are developing for social-communist co-operation, initially at a local and regional level, and an eventual popular front. In West Germany, within the limitations of the mainly two-party system and banning of the left, the electoral tide has manifestly swung to Social Democracy. The rigid cold war military structure of Nato has begun to crack. The advance of the democratic challenge in Spain; the electoral defeat of reaction in Greece earlier this year, and swing to the alliance of the centre and the left, which has brought the release of most, though not yet all, of the political prisoners; the Scandinavian and Belgian elections, with the small, but significant communist gains also in these countries; all these are indications of present popular currents in the capitalist countries.

New Portents

In the world of national liberation the success of the Cairo Conference; the victory of the democratic National Front over the military dictatorship in the Sudan; and the heroic triumphs of the united people of South Vietnam to bring the formidable aggression of the United States invaders within sight of political and military bankruptcy unless an even more dangerous enlargement of the war is attempted: these again are indications of the growing strength of the peoples' advance in the world. At the same time the changes of the top political leadership in the Soviet Union have reaffirmed and strengthened the policies for peaceful co-existence and constructive

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advance, and have been followed by a renewed serious effort, with the presence of the delegation led by Chou En Lai in Moscow, to try to resolve existing differences and strengthen the unity of the international communist and workers' movement, which is of finally decisive importance for the world's future. All these are great new possibilities, full of promise for the future, in the world today, at the moment when the Labour Government replaces Toryism in Britain. It is within these new world conditions that the Labour Government has the opportunity to operate.

Promise and Peril

But if the promise is great, so also are the dangers. At a time when the manifest desire of the peoples everywhere, illustrated by the electoral pointers, is for peace and peaceful co-existence and the relaxation of international tension, and against brinkmanship or trigger-happy nuclear bomb-rattling in the style of a Goldwater or a Home, and for the improvement of living conditions at home, the realities of the international situation show gathering storm-clouds both in the economic sphere, with the mutual bombardment of tariff and currency wars, and in the strategic sphere, with the sharpening of the nuclear arms race. In the international economic situation, so soon as the temporary boom conditions of the capitalist re-equipment and modernisation after war destruction in the Common Market countries and Japan reached completion by the beginning of the sixties, the basic contradictions have begun once more to re-assert themselves with increased force between the titanic expansion of productive power and the restriction of markets, and especially between the dominant monopoly imperialist powers and the majority of the colonial or ex-colonial 'under-developed' nations still exploited by imperialism. This latter most typical contradiction of present-day capitalism, demonstrated in the officially admitted enlarging gulf between what are called 'the rich nations' and 'the poor nations', received sharp expression in the recent Geneva Trade Conference, with the bloc of the 77 nations confronting the representatives of imperialism, and with the highly significant voting on the recommendations now officially published in a White Paper (summarised on p. 559). The battle between rival monopolists rises and finds expression in opposing tariff blocs (Common Market, Efta, etc.), quotas, surcharges, subsidies, currency raids, and a hundred other forms, reflected also in the political field of relations between the powers. The sharp exchanges over the Labour Government's import

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surcharges have highlighted this rising tension. It would indeed be ironic if the Labour Government's economic measures, intended to bring temporary relief to Britain's deficit on the balance of payments, should prove the depth-charge to release an international economic explosion.

Multilateral Menace

These economic conflicts are bound up with the sharpening of political antagonisms (weakening of United States domination in Western Europe; open challenge of De Gaulle against the United States; rifts within the Common Market between De Gaulle and West Germany); the maintenance or extension of colonial wars and aggressions in South-East Asia, the Gulf region or the Congo; and the most dangerous continuing strategic situation (fallacious theory of 'peace through mutual terror'), and yearly increase of expenditure on arms and elaboration and multiplication of nuclear weapons. No step towards nuclear disarmament has so far followed the Partial Test Ban Treaty of last year. Instead, the Western Powers have not only officially rejected the Soviet proposal to renounce the strategy of the first nuclear strike or the Chinese approach for a Conference to ban and destroy all nuclear weapons. They have advanced in the opposite direction by pressing forward the plan, initiated by the American and West German militarists, for some type of so-called multilateral or 'mixed-manned' Nato nuclear force which would in fact, whatever the form finally chosen, in the name of giving the West German militarists a formal joint control over the use and strategy of nuclear weapons, leave only the last wafer-thin partition (as easily shattered at the opportune moment as all the previous supposed 'safeguards' and limitations proclaimed at the outset in putting through German rearmament) to the final stage of direct control of nuclear weapons and strategy by the West German militarists. That moment would mean, not only farewell to the aim of nuclear disarmament, but farewell to peace in Europe and the world. This is the most serious issue before the Labour Government.

Chinese Atom Bomb and Nuclear Disarmament

In vain the American military circles seek to invoke the recent Chinese nuclear test as a supposed justification for their long previous aim for the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the interests of West Germany. The rulers of the United States, the initiators of nuclear war, the prophets of nuclear power as the proclaimed indis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pensable basis of a first class power, and the most direct aggressors pointing nuclear weapons at the heart of China all along its coasts, are the last to have any right to criticise the Chinese atom bomb. Whatever might have been the views of supporters of the Partial Test Ban Treaty at the time of its signature, who had hoped that China might also sign it as a step to make more difficult the fulfilment of the reactionary imperialist plans for the proliferation of nuclear weapons, in fairness to the Chinese People's Government it must be recognised by all that the Chinese atom bomb arose as the answer to this direct American nuclear threat confronting China and openly proclaiming the aim of the future invasion of the Chinese mainland, and was accompanied by a public call for the prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons. Very different are the conditions, economic, technical and political, of the menace of the extension of nuclear arms to West Germany. The existence of the Chinese atom bomb has in practice, not so much affected the immediate strategic situation, as underlined the need to intensify the campaign for nuclear disarmament and for the recognition of China's rights in the United Nations. But in West Germany the advanced economic and technological conditions exist which could immediately, once the barriers to the possession of nuclear weapons were removed, establish a nuclear power capable of aggression. At the same time the political conditions, with the heirs of Hitler in military control and the openly proclaimed aims for the extension of frontiers at the expense of other states, would make such a possibility of nuclear aggression a real menace. It would be fatal, because of an entirely understandable absorption in home problems, to ignore this menace or fail to take the firmest stand to defeat it.

Labour and M.L.F.

What will be the policy of the Labour Government on this issue? The Election Programme declared that Labour will 'oppose the current American proposal for a new mixed-manned nuclear surface fleet (MLF)'. This very limited rejection, however, of the specific 'current' plan was accompanied by the advocacy of 'constructive proposals for integrating all Nato's nuclear weapons under effective political control so that all the partners in the Alliance have a proper share in their deployment and control'. These propositions were understood to have been the lines of discussion of Gordon Walker in Washington, to be followed up in Bonn and by the Premier's prospective visit to meet President Johnson in December. What this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in reality very much enlarged version of a multilateral nuclear force with West German participation in control might mean was spelled out by no less an authority than *The Times* Defence correspondent, Mr. Gwynne-Jones, in an article appearing in *The Times* on October 23, or precisely the day before his inclusion in the Government was officially announced as Minister for Disarmament.

Lady of Riga

The essence of these proposals, given as the Government's plan, and stated to be viewed with favour by Washington, was not only to assign all Britain's nuclear forces, including the prospective Polaris submarines under a re-negotiated Nassau, to a joint Nato force under combined control, but to establish a double veto on operation, that is, alongside the existing sole United States control, a collective West European veto, with voting power weighted according to participation, such that 'no European country should be able on its own to veto the use of the force'. According to an estimate given elsewhere than in this article, a two-thirds majority would be required for the use of the joint nuclear force and 67 per cent of the votes would be in the hands of the United States and West Germany. The effect would be, according to the explicit statement of Mr. Gwynne-Jones in *The Times* article quoted, to prevent 'the use of the force to be subject to the veto of a single European country —such as Britain'. In other words, if the United States and West Germany should judge that a situation had arisen in which they decided to launch a nuclear war with Nato nuclear forces, including British nuclear forces and the use of nuclear bases in Britain, this could be decided, and Britain in consequence wiped off the face of the earth within a matter of minutes, without any say of the British Government or people, and even overriding their minority opposition to such a prospect. This is the appalling plan which, according to these semi-official indications, is being solemnly discussed at present between the United States and West German militarists and Labour Government spokesmen, represented by Gordon Walker and Gwynne-Jones, for what would be in effect a U.S.-German-British military alliance, with Britain cast for the rôle of the Lady of Riga taken for a ride on the Tiger. It is obvious that, if any steps were taken along these lines, this would be the most deadly menace yet confronting Britain. It is urgent that the labour movement and people of this country, whatever the preoccupation with home problems, should be alerted in time to defeat this menace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At Home and Abroad

The more these questions of world policy are examined (and there are many others worthy of attention in the overseas military and colonial sphere, including the war in Malaysia or the dangerous continuity with Tory policy in British Guiana), the more obvious it will become that these cannot be separated from the urgent home questions which press upon the living conditions of the people. Just as with the previous Labour Government the price of Bevin abroad was Cripps at home, so now a similar danger threatens. The energy with which the new ministerial team have from the very first days of office set themselves to the task of carrying through the not inconsiderable range of legislative and administrative measures of reform promised in their election programme, and at the same time to endeavour to tackle the heavy problems of Britain's economic situation inherited from the Tory Government, has aroused a wide popular recognition and response, and a readiness to co-operate for bold policies of advance. This is a favourable political situation for support for progressive policies, comparable to the positive aspects and trends of popular feeling and expression already noted in the international situation.

A New Political Climate

If the general election itself still revealed considerable scepticism and distrust, as demonstrated in the lower poll than 1959 and the fact that the slump in the Tory vote was not accompanied by an increase in the Labour vote, the subsequent formation of the Labour Government, its composition from a wide range of Labour representatives, and its obvious determination to go forward with its programme, despite the narrow parliamentary majority, has heightened the whole level of political consciousness. There is a new political climate of a confident and strengthened popular determination to move forward. It is undesirable that this favourable political climate should be shattered by that Achilles' heel of every Labour Government, a reactionary foreign policy inspired by anti-communism, frustrating the aims of progressive reforms at home, and leading instead to the imposition of burdens on the people.

Whose Hundred Days?

Napoleon's Hundred Days took him from Elba to Waterloo and St. Helena. However, we can be confident that Harold Wilson's proclamation of his Hundred Days was intended, not so much to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recall the original historical precedent, as rather to echo the model of President Franklin Roosevelt, who used the same slogan to inaugurate his régime when he took over the United States in the depth of the Great Depression in 1933. But in fact neither analogy is useful for the profoundly new type of problem of Britain today. The situation of Britain today is almost as different from the United States of Roosevelt in 1933 as from the France of Napoleon. The United States of 1933, choking to death in the fetters of its own economic system, was simultaneously abounding in wealth, resources and productive power. Even so the chronic mass unemployment continued all through the thirties, and was only interrupted, not by the New Deal, but by the second world war. Britain, on the other hand, the classic original home of capitalism and the first leader of world imperialism, presents today the no less classic picture of the closing stage of a world imperialist power in extreme decline, whose ruling class refuses to accept the end of its era, but insists on burdening and straining the already weakened home resources and economy in order to maintain its position as a world imperialist power and continuing vast network of overseas exploitation—still, despite all the decolonisation or loss of some of the exported capital during the war, built up anew to a higher figure than ever. The physical expression of this contradiction is the recurring deficit on the balance of payments which has most sharply characterised these two decades since the war (it had begun to appear on a smaller scale already during the decade before the second world war), and whose onset, each time its conquest has been proudly proclaimed by the government of the day, has returned with successively greater force and on a larger scale. The deficit on the balance of payments is the neuralgic point where the inseparable connection of Britain's international policy with the conditions of life of the people at home is laid bare, and international policy is revealed as governing home policy.

Bipartisan Deficit

This deficit on the balance of payments is not a special product of Tory rule since 1951, any more than the varying types of recurring restrictionist measures, sometimes described as the 'stop-go' policy, designed to meet it. Such a picture belongs to the realm of electoral propagandist mythology as much as the parallel Tory picture of the immediate post-war shortages and rationing arising from the destructive effects of the war as a supposed product of Labour doctrinaire theories. The deficit has recurred continuously during the two

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decades since the war, alike under Labour and Tory Governments. The previous highest deficit until this year was that of 1947, under the Labour Government, reaching £443 million. There followed the desperate austerity measures of Cripps, to freeze wages and force up output and exports. No sooner had triumph been proclaimed with the surplus of 1950 (actually reflecting the Korean war boom) than the deficit reappeared in 1951 to a total of £419 million. The Tory Government, taking over, went through the same cycle of alternating boasts of recovery and renewal of the deficit, until this year the deficit has reached the highest record yet, totalling £341 million in the first half year or the equivalent of £682 million for the full year (the White Paper alarmist estimate of £800 million for this year is probably a deliberate over-estimate to encourage acceptance of the severe measures imposed, and to prepare the way for a sigh of relief and hosanna for the triumph of the beginning of recovery when the final figures are published). Thus the deficit is not the special product of one or the other party. It is the characteristic symptom of the crisis of British imperialism, continuously and increasingly overspending abroad and crippling the home economy and development in order to maintain the world exploiting interests of the big monopolies and financial houses.

Lost Warnings

In a little booklet entitled *Britain's Crisis of Empire,* published in 1949, the present writer sought to warn the Labour Government of that date that the deficit which had caused such panic in 1947 was not a temporary phenomenon of post-war unsettlement, as was then alleged, but was the consequence of this reactionary and extravagant imperialist foreign and military policy, and would recur and frustrate all the plans for social reform, unless that policy were changed. Needless to say, the warning fell on deaf ears, since in that year the Labour Government was celebrating the triumphant recovery from the deficit with the reappearance of the surplus in 1949, rising to £297 million in 1950. Then followed the deficit of £419 million in 1951 and the fall of the Labour Government. In 1953 this pertinacious author enlarged his thesis into a considerable volume entitled *The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire* to renew his warning as equally valid for the Tory Government. Once again his warning fell on deaf ears; for in that year the Tory Government was celebrating its triumphant recovery from the deficit of 1951 with the surplus of £170 million on the current balance in 1952, £151 million

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 1953 and £121 million in 1954. But by 1955 the deficit had reappeared. So in 1957, in the new revised edition of *The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire* the author in the Preface to this second edition ventured to draw on this experience to observe:

> At the time when the first version of this study appeared in 1949, and the fuller and more developed version in 1953, there was still very little disposition to recognise these deeper problems of Britain's position in the modern world. In 1949 the supposed triumph of 'recovery' under the Labour Government, and in 1953 the supposed triumph of 'recovery' under the Conservative Government, blinded the general outlook to the deeper problems requiring to be faced.
>
> However, the facts themselves cannot be so easily exorcised. The facile dreams of 'recovery' without facing the basic problems have now twice faded. It is to be hoped that the time is now opportune for a more serious consideration of the problems which the British people are having to face and solve. (March 1957.)

Lost words again. By 1960 the deficit had reappeared. And now we are having the record deficit of 1964. But it is still being handled in the old superficial fashion, in the same false terms adopted each time during the past seventeen years, as a question of importing too much and not exporting enough, while the real guilt of the profligate overseas government expenditure, mainly military expenditure, which is the actual cause of the deficit, is kept carefully hidden from view. The drunken head of the family, insolvent with gambling debts, exhorts his household to economise and work harder, in order that the family as a whole may pay their way.

Guilty Secret

The plain fact cannot be too often emphasised that it is the Government's own overseas expenditure, mainly military, which is the direct cause of the deficit. It is not a question of an affluent nation consuming more and more imports, and failing to export enough to pay for them, and therefore needing to work harder, produce more and export more in order to be solvent. This is only the official myth. In reality the imports surplus, or disproportion of imports exceeding exports—the characteristic expression of imperialist parasitism—used to be much greater before the war, and also much greater in proportion before the first world war. During the two decades since the war the drive to increase output and exports has been so intense that nowadays over most years a much higher proportion of imports of goods is paid for by exports of goods than ever before in the history of British imperialism (last year the deficit on visible trade was only £49 million; nearly 99 per cent of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the imports of goods was paid for by exports of goods). Export of capital, which is presented as the main cause of the deficit by another school of experts, plays a rôle, but is largely balanced by foreign investment of capital into Britain, so that last year the net export of private capital was only £50 million. This net export of private capital is only a small proportion of the very large tribute income received from the exported capital. The official return recorded a gross income of £782 million last year from 'interest, profits and dividends' on overseas capital holdings, or, after deducting the corresponding amount paid out on foreign capital holdings in Britain, a new tribute income, under this heading alone, of £377 million, or seven and a half times the amount of the exported capital. Thus the net export of private capital of £50 million is not so much a real drain on the British economy as the normal re-investment of a portion of the overseas tribute income in order to maintain and expand the volume of overseas capital at the expense of the peoples it exploits. By contrast with these relatively smaller figures of a liability of £49 million on trade or £50 million on the export of capital—all more than abundantly paid for by the net overseas tribute income—there stands out in conspicuous prominence as the decisive debit item the overwhelmingly larger figure of net Government overseas expenditure, for which there is no counterbalancing return, recorded last year as amounting to £387 million, of which £251 million represented overseas military expenditure. The figures are higher this year.

Price of the Loot

This Government overseas expenditure, mainly military, which rocks Britain's balance of payments, represents the costs of maintaining Britain as a world imperialist power, that is, of maintaining the world imperialist exploitation and tribute which is the present basis of Britain's economic and political structure. Lenin long ago showed how this imperialist basis, and the parasitism to which it gave rise, was crippling British home industrial and productive development and causing the once foremost industrial nation to go downwards in the world scale. But at that time the military costs of maintaining this system of loot was mainly charged to the subject empire countries, especially to India, with the costs of overseas colonial wars and military adventures going down in the Indian budget, and with wholesale use of Indian or Gurkha troops for these purposes under British officers. There was in effect no overseas

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military expenditure falling on the British budget. Thus in 1938 the net 'property income from abroad' was returned at £192 million, or net 'invisibles' income at £232 million, while Government overseas expenditure was only £16 million. But since the second world war, with the advance of national liberation leading to heavier overseas military costs for colonial wars and garrisons and successively transferred bases, in addition to Nato occupation costs, and with the newly independent states no longer willing to carry in their budgets the costs of British imperialism, the overseas military costs of imperialism have fallen directly on the British economy to pay. By 1950 'property income from abroad' was returned at £337 million, but overseas military expenditure had reached £100 million. By 1963 net 'property income from abroad' was returned at £580 million; but overseas military expenditure had risen to £251 million. Subsequent returns would show a higher figure of £350 million (*Financial Times*, August 25, 1964); and this would only include foreign currency costs, not the total cost of the overseas garrisons, bases and equipment, which remains, as the House of Commons Estimates Committee found, a secret not to be ascertained. Although the total of the loot has been forced up, the disproportion between the loot and the costs of extracting the loot has radically changed since the still relatively halcyon days of British imperialism up to the second world war. Hence all these tears. The bandit business, although more and more troublesome and hazardous and costly, is still profitable for the big monopolists who get the loot. But it is throwing on the British people ever heavier burdens, which are reflected in the crisis of the balance of payments, resulting in desperate emergency measures to make the people pay.

Hiding the Truth

This elementary truth of Britain's real situation, underlying all the problems, is kept hidden by every possible means and device of official propaganda. Thus B.B.C. *Panorama* preceded Wilson's broadcast on the deficit by a popular explanation of how the deficit arose. Every item in the account was illustrated with little pictures and bricks piling up on each side to show the income and expenditure items and the resultant balance. Even the income from the Beatles' trip to the United States was duly depicted, or the expenditure of trippers abroad. Export of capital, and countervailing import of capital, was not omitted. But the biggest debit item of all, the overseas military expenditure of £350 million, did not appear. It

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vanished. It did not exist. After the conscientious rehearsal of all the other items, plus and minus, even very small ones of a few million pounds, and placing them visually on each side of the addition, there was a sudden jump to announce the portentous resultant total deficit, even though it was obvious that the sum as given did not add up. Harold Wilson's immediately following talk as Prime Minister to explain to the public in easy words all about the deficit and what the Government was trying to do, was equally silent on the main item, and proceeded along the familiar lines about the nation importing too much and not exporting enough, and the consequent necessity to reduce imports and work harder and produce more cheaply and export more, so that the national family could pay its way. It was left to the Governor of the Bank of England, Lord Cromer, speaking at the Mansion House dinner after Chancellor Callaghan, to call attention to the fact that the 'indulgence' which it had now become essential to limit in order to avoid bankruptcy did not merely mean consumption at home or excess imports, but Government overseas expenditure on 'undertakings and ventures overseas'.

Wrong Diagnosis—Wrong Remedies

This conventional distorted and fictitious presentation of the real problem of Britain's present position, proclaimed equally by Tory and Labour Ministers, the press (other than the *Daily Worker*, and the financial journals not read by the general public) and the broadcasting authorities, is not only equivalent to deceiving the public in order to secure acceptance of unacceptable policies. The Government Ministers and Treasury experts themselves equally base their prescriptions on this bogus analysis, as if they believed it to be true. Substituting the symptoms for the disease, they treat the problem as if it were only a problem of trade, of excessive imports and inadequate exports, and therefore the emergency economic measures of the imports surcharge on manufactured imports and the tax-rebate subsidy for exports. According to Mr. Wilson, these measures were taken over from Mr. Maudling ('we had the authority of Mr. Maudling for the measures taken; they were his measures': Harold Wilson in Parliament, November 3). The effect of these measures, so far from curing the disease, could even aggravate it. By doubling the average rate of British tariffs and making Britain a high protectionist country, British manufacturers have been in practice incited to concentrate on this protected home market with enhanced prices rather

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than export. On the other hand, since one-third of the imports of manufacturers was in fact machinery and capital goods for production, exporters would either be deprived of essential machinery for their production, if the ban were effective, or would have to pay steeply higher prices for it, resulting in higher prices and less competitive effectiveness for their exports; while foreign countries, faced with barriers against their exports to Britain, will inevitably seek to buy less from Britain. The dangers of this fiscal policy are obvious, and the real drain is so far left untouched. Considerable disillusionment is likely to follow these emergency economic measures, as their inadequacy becomes realised and the international repercussions make themselves increasingly felt.

Budget and Incomes Policy

In reality the real strategic aim behind these emergency economic measures, which are presented for popular consumption as only a question of correcting the trade balance and restricting imports and stimulating exports, is not in the end so different from some of the effects of the old 'stop-go' methods of deflation. The Government has estimated that £175 million will be obtained by the Exchequer from the import surcharges. This is equivalent to additional indirect taxation, which will be extracted from the consuming public through higher prices (it is only in the protectionist's utopia that 'the foreigner pays'), and thus diminish personal incomes by an amount roughly equivalent to Selwyn Lloyd's squeeze—unless wage increases are won to counteract this. And it is here that comes the other prong of the offensive—the 'incomes policy'. These lines are written before the autumn budget due to be promulgated on November 11. It is understood that this budget is expected to contain some urgently needed increases in pensions and social benefits, but at the same time, alongside whatever forms of taxation of capital gains or profits are finally decided on, sharp increases in the workers' contributions to the social services, and possibly other taxes falling on the people. Experience has always shown that taxes on profits tend in the final outcome to get passed on and fail to restrict the growth of the total volume of profits, while increased contributions drawn from the workers or other charges placed upon them cannot be similarly passed on. In these conditions the fight for wage increases becomes all the more important. And it is precisely here that the crux of the situation is revealed, as every attempt is being pressed, in the name of the national emergency, in the name of the supposed limitation of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

profits, to induce the unions to forego or weaken their fight for wage increases.

Two Alternative Roads

Thus in the end, behind all the variations of form, the same alternatives stand out as throughout these two decades. Either the disastrous reactionary imperialist foreign policies, which find expression in the crippling overseas military expenditure and arms programme, and are the direct immediate cause of Britain's deficit and current economic difficulties, are changed. Or the costs fall on the living standards of the people and compel the stunting of the aims of social advance. Such was the experience of the six years of the Attlee Labour Government. Such was the experience of the people under thirteen years of Tory rule. This time it must be the concern of the whole labour movement that the outcome shall be different: that the fight for the defence and advance of the living standards of the people shall be maintained and carried forward, hand in hand with the fight for the changes in Britain's international policy which the situation requires.

R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

ANATOLE FRANCE

He adhered to that revolutionary ideal, of which it might be said according to one's point of view that it constitutes either the loyal end, the highest form, or else the counterpart of the democratic ideal's lifeless algebraical dissertations around the terms justice, equality and international solidarity. He showed himself a convinced partisan of the Bolshevik revolution. . . . He several times publicly bore witness to his approval of the proletarian cause. . . . And yet, near as he then was to us, one felt that he was the prey of two tendencies, two urges: the one, entirely intellectual, the consequence of his superior clear-sightedness, led him naturally across the chaos of facts and the gross deviations of contemporary thought to extreme causes and results. The other came from a too long-standing literary habit of scepticism, of gentleness and of laughter and from a temperament which delighted in serene calm. His spirit was ahead of his character; his spirit was bold and free; but *he*, he was not. There was something tragic in seeing this eminent veteran, overwhelmed with talents and with glory, and endowed with such seductive charm, finding his sincerity and then struggling against it; raising himself towards the light and then being afraid of it, like Dido of old. Alas, the character is heavier than the spirit.

(From 'Anatole France and the Revolutionary Idea') by Henri Barbusse, *Labour Monthly*, December 1924.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

INCOMES POLICY AND THE UNIONS

J. E. Mortimer

THE central proposition of the case for an incomes policy is simple enough. It is that the growth in total money incomes in any year should not outstrip the growth in production. If it does, and providing somewhere near full employment exists, prices will rise. If, on the other hand, the total of incomes rises by no more than the expansion of production, including both goods and services, then prices will remain steady.

All this seems very sensible and reasonable, and on the face of it, all that remains is to convince every income receiver to limit his demands to an amount which fits in with the national plan for economic development. Thus, if there is to be a 4 per cent growth per year in total output the rise in wages, salaries, profits, interest, rent and social service benefits should be limited to an amount slightly less than 4 per cent. This will then leave a surplus to be used, say, for a more rapid rate of expansion in education, the health service, overseas development, exports or for some other purpose which the government of the day regards as socially desirable. All this can be achieved, so the argument runs, with constant prices. This would help not only our exports but would protect the standard of living of those who live on fixed incomes, particularly pensioners of various kinds.

The need for an incomes policy was supported in the election policy statements of each of the three main political parties, the Labour Party, the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. With such unanimous political support it may seem strange that no-one has yet produced a plan to carry it into effect. Why is this? Basically, because the problem touches the fundamental difference of economic interest between various groups in society. Although it is a commonplace nowadays to speak of the harmony of interest of all sections of the nation, the reality is still very different. All forms of income do not carry equal social justification. Anyone who implies that they do, is either making a shallow analysis which adds nothing to social understanding or else he is deceiving people into believing that 'to make money' means the same thing as 'to earn money'.

The majority of the British people earn their livelihood by their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal labour. For this purpose it matters not whether the citizen is a labourer, a craftsman, a technician, a scientist, an administrator or, say, a professional surgeon or architect. His is a personal contribution to the output of goods and services which are produced to satisfy human wants. In return for this personal contribution the citizen receives a wage, a salary or, in the case of certain professions, a fee. But the largest incomes in British society are not derived from personal labour of this kind. They are a reward for the ownership of industry or other forms of property. Nor is this vital contrast affected by the fact that some of those who own industry also work as administrators. It still remains true that in the case of the largest incomes much the greater part of it represents a return for the ownership of industry or other forms of property and only a small part represents a salary for personal service.

This distinction between income derived from personal labour and income derived from ownership is recognised, in broad terms, for income tax purposes by the Inland Revenue in the different rates of taxation for earned income and unearned income. Very roughly, of the total value of Britain's output, not much more than 60 per cent goes to those who make a personal contribution by their labour. Somewhere between 30 per cent and 40 per cent is appropriated by those whose claim rests on ownership. Of this 30 per cent to 40 per cent, part is used to maintain an extremely high standard of living for a small minority in the community, part is used to supplement the income—sometimes in a modest and sometimes in a not so modest way—of a minority of those whose main income is derived from their personal labour, and part is re-invested for economic expansion. When re-invested it remains the property of the investor and creates further private claims against future expanded output.

The trouble with much of the discussion about incomes policy is that it fails to distinguish in any socially significant sense between one kind of income and another. It lumps everything together and suggests, if by no more than by implication, that a 4 per cent rise in wages is neither more nor less justified than a 4 per cent rise in profits or interest. Such an attitude ought not to be approved. The claim of those who work and of those who are dependent on social service benefits, whether pensioners, widows, the unemployed or the sick, ought to have broad priority.

When a worker takes a job he knows in advance what his basic wage will be. If he does not ask for a wage increase or, if his employer refuses to concede one, his wages are rigidly controlled. This

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not the case with profits. Mr. George Brown, Minister for Economic Affairs, put it this way in the Commons debate on the Queen's Speech, 'One has to recognise that profits differ in character from earned incomes since they arise as a residue rather than as a main element in costs and are not subject to negotiation'. The aim of private business is to maximise the difference between the price of a commodity and the costs of production. The residue, after allowance has been made for the depreciation of the equipment, including factory buildings, used in the process of production, is profit.

Every improvement in productivity must result in benefit in one direction or another. If it is not reflected in higher wages or lower prices it will have the effect of swelling profits. This assumes for the moment that over the short period, the prices of raw materials will remain constant. From the point of view of private business there is no inducement to reduce prices unless it can be shown that such a course is likely to stimulate sales to the point where the *total* profit on the increased output at a lower selling price is greater than it would be on the more limited output at a higher selling price. Sometimes business men expect higher profits from lower prices, but more usually they do not. Monopolistic and price-fixing arrangements are so widespread in British industry that the incentive to reduce prices as a means to expand sales and output operates in far fewer instances than is often assumed.

The Government propose to establish a price review body which, according to Mr. Brown, can 'discover and examine the facts and report'. Such a body may help in a limited way to restrain price increases but too much cannot be expected of it. There are tens of thousands of prices operating throughout the economy and a price review body can probably do no more than examine trends for a number of important commodities. The surveys which it makes are bound to take time and evidence will have to be taken. Finally, if the price review body decides that a firm or firms are acting in a manner contrary to the national interest there is not very much they can do about it. Each firm is answerable, ultimately, to its shareholders and not to a Government sponsored price review body. Shareholders judge management by profit expectations; not by its responsiveness to Government wishes.

The Government will not be content only with a price review body. They have already said that they will deal by taxation with any 'excessive growth of profits and dividends'. They probably have in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind recovering by taxation any increase in profits on a national scale beyond what is regarded as acceptable in the public interest. Such a tax would express the determination of the Government not to permit profits to escape from the requirements of a national incomes policy. It must, however, be recognised that such a tax would operate very inequitably between one firm and another. It would fall equally on a firm whose profits grow because of efficiency and on a firm whose profits grow because of over-charging. Very high rates of taxation on profits also tend to encourage inefficiency and profligate 'expense account' spending. The plain fact is that under capitalism there is no satisfactory way of controlling profits in the long term. Nor is it practicable to control wages from a central body. There are too many factors to be taken into account which depend on the circumstances of each industry or even of each particular undertaking. Industry and commerce are not static. Changes are constantly taking place and collective bargaining at both national and plant level must reflect these changes.

Even if a 'guiding light' for wage and salary increases is given by the Government of the day, it cannot be applied automatically to every group of workers. Some industries or firms are expanding and others are contracting. The public interest may be served by encouraging workers by different rates of pay to change their jobs. In some firms or industries workers will justifiably expect to receive higher earnings for higher production. So too will workers employed in firms where profits are increasing. To ask workers in such circumstances not to press for wage increases would be to ask the impossible. Much of what nowadays is described as 'wage drift' is the result of the operation of labour market forces of this kind.

Unions of skilled workers and of technical staff are also concerned to maintain and in some cases to increase differentials for skill. A succession of official reports—for example the Feilden Report on Engineering Design—have made the case for such differentials. The problem in Britain is that the differentials for skill are too low rather than too high. Unions covering workers on low wages are also determined to raise the living standards of their members. It is right and proper that they should do so. Low subsistence standards among a group of workers in a wealthy nation are not only socially wrong, they also encourage inefficiency in employment. High wages and the pressure for better living standards act as a spur to management to increase efficiency. Clearly, no central system of wage determination could deal fairly and adequately with the different circumstances of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the many industries, firms and occupations in Britain. The machinery of collective bargaining must be maintained and unions must continue to prosecute the interests of their members.

This does not mean, however, that nothing at all can be done to try to bring about a situation in which there will be a planned improvement in *real* wages for the working people of Britain. The task of the Government is to create an economic environment under which working people will feel that their interests are being protected. There is no single formula for creating such an environment, and it does not help to foster illusions about the nature of capitalist society and the extent to which profits and prices can be made subject to public control.

The essential requirements are that the Government should carry out resolutely its economic and social mandate, that its tax policies should assist the working people and should help to prevent profiteering, and that by its international policies it should proceed towards the further relaxation of tension so that the drain on British resources arising from military commitments is reduced. If such an environment can be created the Government would not appeal in vain for trade union support in an incomes policy. Trade unionists would know that it would be in their own interests to increase wages and salaries in such a way that social progress would not be jeopardised. The principal responsibility for creating such an environment rests with the Government. In the words of the 1964 T.U.C. resolution on economic planning and wages the effectiveness of the Government's policies will be measured by 'the extent to which they improve the living standard and raise real wages of all workers, remove the threat of unemployment, improve working conditions, and bring about a more equitable distribution of the national wealth'.

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume for 1964

A history of the year's events!
A permanent record
A 'must' for every labour movement Library

ORDERS BEING TAKEN NOW!

Through your usual newsagents, price £1 10s 0d, or send 10s 6d plus 1s 6d postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

The Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRADE UNIONS AND THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT

Peter Kerrigan

THE final resolution passed by this year's Trades Union Congress was the Boilermakers', which said:

> This Congress declares its intention to do everything possible to ensure an electoral victory for the Labour Party at the forthcoming general election.

In financial support, organisation and votes cast, there is no doubt the trade unions' contribution was a major factor in tipping the balance which brought defeat to the Tories.

Now that there is a Labour Government and we have had the Queen's speech, it is of great importance to consider a few of the major problems affecting the trade unions under a Labour Government. Three are outstanding: incomes policy, industrial action, and trade union law.

For years, and especially since July 1961, the Tories have tried to operate a wage freeze policy which has been consistently opposed by the trade unions. At the T.U.C. this year, the future Prime Minister devoted a considerable part of his speech as fraternal delegate from the Labour Party to advocating an incomes policy under a Labour Government. Harold Wilson set out three conditions. First, 'an assurance of rising production and rising incomes so that the sacrifice, the restraint we ask for is matched by an assurance it will result in increased production and increased rewards'. Second, 'an assurance of equity and social justice'. Third, 'an assurance that what we ask for in wages and salaries will apply equally to profits and dividends and rents'. Since then he has repeated his proposals in television broadcasts, and now in the Queen's Speech there is the demand to get rid of restrictive practices.

It is imperative to establish certain facts in respect to the proposed incomes policy. First of all, production is lagging behind and Britain has failed to increase its sales in the export markets, but the imports tariffs will not help in this situation. On the contrary, because foreign cars and other goods receive this additional protection, it will be easier to sell in the home market than abroad. At the same time, it can increase the cost of living by higher prices and handicap the re-equipment of industry by dearer machine tools and other specialised foreign equipment for British factories.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secondly, there are no proposals so far for controlling profits and dividends, and the Labour Chancellor as far back as the Labour Party Conference of 1963 admitted he did not see how it could be done. A capital gains tax does not do the job. The Federation of British Industries has declared that no workable method could be devised to find a way in which prices and profits discipline might be exercised. Thirdly, and most important of all, wages in Britain over the past period have risen more slowly than those of our principal European competitors, who have no incomes policy operating, yet these competitors have been outselling us in the export markets where we are competing against them, whether in the U.S., the Commonwealth, Europe or elsewhere.

An incomes policy would hold down wage and salary rises in industries where production is increasing, and would mean much higher profits for the monopolists. Among other adverse effects it would stop low-paid workers from getting bigger wage rises to reduce the gap between them and the higher paid workers. In particular, it would prevent women workers from more quickly reaching their aim of equal pay for equal work. There is no indication in the Queen's Speech of Government action to implement this principle. And if the Labour Government intends to increase M.P.s' and Ministers' salaries by quite substantial amounts, what right have they to propose wage restraint for the workers?

It is complete nonsense to say that wage restraint is required for planning the economy. The only way in which the economy could be planned is if the monopolies are taken over and run for the people instead of for capitalist profiteers. The Labour Government only intends to nationalise steel, leaving all the other monopolies from chemicals and oil to engineering, motors, aircrafts, shipping, insurance and banking in the hands of the capitalists. The most immediate aid to the economy is not a wage stop under the guise of an incomes policy, but the ending of the £350 million of overseas military expenditure and a stop to the other £300 million exported for investment abroad. It is significant that for the first time the Labour Chancellor did mention this problem of military expenditure overseas and promised to examine it.

This is the background to the present wages claims, of which the dockers and railwaymen are the most immediate. The dockers have shown exemplary patience in pursuing their claim for an immediate increase of 25s. and proportionate advances on piece rates. The employers have stuck at a 12s. 6d. per week offer plus an increase

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the miserable fall-back wage and a percentage increase on piece rates. When the employers talk in terms of what this means in percentage increases on the present low wages, it must be remembered that it is two years since the dockers got a pay increase; therefore the percentages need to be halved and the 25s. claim then appears to be very moderate indeed.

The dockers have tendered strike notices, and Ray Gunter, the Minister of Labour, has set up a Court of Inquiry which is to report on both the wage claim and other issues including very controversial ones related to the operation of gangs, different methods of work and speed-up in the docks. The intention of the Court of Inquiry appears to be to work towards finishing their recommendations on wages in time for these to be considered before the beginning of December, when the official strike notices expire. The Docks delegate conference of the Transport and General Workers' and the other docks unions involved have three times rejected the employers' offer. The findings of the Court of Inquiry can only be recommendations. The unions are not required to accept if they regard them as unsuitable. The present temper of the dockers as reflected in the Delegate Conference decisions, the one-day stoppages, and mass meetings held by the rank and file Dockers' Liaison Committee would indicate that the men are unlikely to be satisfied with less than their fuller demands. Their wages claim has an importance reaching far beyond the ports of Britain. It is being followed, as will the claim of the railwaymen, with the closest attention by active trade unionists throughout Britain. A victory for the dockers and railwaymen will be a victory for the whole trade union movement and a warning to the Labour Government to think again about its so-called incomes policy.

The Government has given a pledge to bring in legislation to re-establish the legal rights of the trade unions, in respect to strike action, to what they were before the *Rookes v. Barnard* and *Stratford v. Lindley* judgements of the House of Lords. It is important that this is accomplished speedily. Moreover, the trade unions should make clear that a Labour Government has many more urgent things to do than contemplate any enquiry into the legal position of the trade unions or into their relationship with the State.

The attitude adopted by Mr. Ray Gunter both before and since his appointment as the Minister of Labour makes this question a matter of great importance. In *Socialist Commentary*, April 1964, Gunter called on the trade unions to reorganise themselves to fit in with the capitalist set-up, saying: 'I am persuaded that unless the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unions face the facts of life as they are in the late 1960's, then in seven to ten years time the State will have to intervene. Industrial courts will be created and any dispute will be referred to them . . . trade unions are not eternal. They will exist just as long as they are relevant to the times in which they seek to exist'. It is rather serious that a man holding these views is Minister of Labour. Views by the way which evoked the statement from a fellow member of the Labour Party Executive, Mr. John Boyd of the Amalgamated Engineering Union: 'He will require to undergo an intensive apprenticeship if he expects our movement to accept him as a suitable Minister of Labour after the next General Election'. Gunter's apprenticeship does not seem to have been satisfactory to judge by his first act, which was to condemn the dockers' one-day stoppage as irresponsible. On the contrary, the rank and file dockers and their Liaison Committee have all along shown considerable restraint and great responsibility.

The trade unions have a great fund of goodwill towards the Labour Government and a deep hatred of Toryism. But they will not be bullied into supporting policies which worsen their conditions and at the same time weaken the position of the Labour Government itself. It is only by driving forward to implement the programme on which it was returned; by improving the conditions of the old age pensioners, the sick and the children; by building the houses, hospitals and schools; by repealing the Rent Act and keeping down rents; and by giving support to the trade unions in their struggles to defend the standard of their members, that the Labour Government will strengthen its position and avoid the danger of a Tory comeback. It is pertinent also to remark here that such efforts as are indicated in the A.E.U. Executive's proposal to debar all in the union except Labour Party members from contributing to the political levy or voting on matters relating to the political objects for which the fund is raised, pose issues with very dangerous implications. It will be fatal at this stage, when more and bigger unions are joining the T.U.C. and when it is necessary to ensure that the unions rally all their forces in defence of the workers' conditions and rights, to create the impression that it is the intention of right-wing trade union leaders to turn the unions either into appendages of the Labour Party or try to integrate them into the capitalist state apparatus. Above all at this moment, the unions require to maintain their position as fighting instruments of the membership, unhampered by any restrictions. Then they will both improve the position of their members and ensure the Labour Government repels all Tory attacks.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MANIFESTO

OF

SIGNED BY THE PROVISIONAL COUNCIL AT THE FOUNDATION OF THE LEAGUE ON 30th DEC. 1884, AND ADOPTED AT

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

Held at FARRINGDON HALL, LONDON, on JULY 5th, 1885.

A New Edition, Annotated by

WILLIAM MORRIS AND E. BELFORT BAX.

LONDON:
Socialist League Office,
13 FARRINGDON ROAD, HOLBORN VIADUCT, E.C.
1885.
PRICE ONE PENNY.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE VOICE OF THE PIONEERS

EIGHTY years ago, this month, the Socialist League—one of the first Socialist organisations in Great Britain, numbering William Morris, Eleanor Marx and Belfort Bax among its leaders—adopted its Manifesto and began issuing its propaganda to the working class, as timely and fresh today as it was then.

* * *

The land, the capital, the machinery, factories, workshops, stores, means of transit, mines, banking, all means of production and distribution of wealth, must be declared and treated as the common property of all.

No solution would be that State Socialism, by whatever name it may be called, whose aim it would be to make concessions to the working class while leaving the present system of capital and wages still in operation: no number of merely administrative changes, until the workers are in possession of all political power, could make any real approach to Socialism.

From the Manifesto of the Socialist League (*December* 1884).

* * *

Capitalism—production for profit—presupposes a class of property-holders, who monopolise the means of living, and a class who have only their labour-force to offer in exchange for the necessaries of life. Given this, and you have the conditions of a capitalist mode of production at hand. With a capitalistic mode of production is given the antagonism of capital and labour so-called, or rather of the capitalist and the labourer.

The good-natured reformer would fain lull such antagonisms to rest by palliatives, make of governing and governed, rich and poor, capitalist and labourer a united happy family, by smooth talk and practical measures. His efforts are vain. We tell you that these antagonisms will never sleep. But though they will not sleep, yet they shall all be changed. And the change will be accomplished by the very severity of their conflict. A completely collective ownership of the means of production and of distribution will necessarily deprive these distinctions, so important in our present social order, of all validity whatever.

From the Socialist League's 'Address to Trades Unions' by Belfort Bax (1885).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES ELECTIONS

Herbert Aptheker

THE word which best describes the 1964 elections in the United States is—unprecedented.

Never before in American history had the entire right united; never before had such a united right captured completely the national apparatus of a major political party; never before had the electorate so naked a choice: for or against fascism, for or against peaceful co-existence, for or against social progress. And never before was a Presidential candidate of one of the two major parties so sweepingly defeated and repudiated.

Even Franklin Delano Roosevelt—the greatest campaigner of them all—never received, in his four successful efforts, so high a percentage of the popular vote as did President Johnson. In 1936, when Roosevelt was riding the crest of New Deal popularity and was opposed by a nonentity, he still did not quite reach the 61 per cent of the total vote that was this year given to Johnson. At that time, Roosevelt's popular plurality came to about eleven millions; this time Johnson's popular plurality is approximately sixteen millions. And to get the full impact of that vote, it must be borne in mind that in 1960, Kennedy's popular vote exceeded that given Nixon by only 100,000.

Emphasis must be placed upon the deep content of this election. The overwhelming defeat of Goldwaterism was a defeat for a policy made quite explicit in the Republican Party platform and in the speeches of the candidates: unmistakably the electorate rejected brinkmanship, the freezing of the Cold War, commitment to 'winning' the Cold War—which meant in fact, launching the third world war; it rejected a domestic policy which would have thrown the labour movement back to the 1920's and the Negro people's movement back to 1900; it rejected a social philosophy which blamed poverty upon the poor and was redolent of the days of McKinley. The *New York Times* editorial, the day after the election, was correct in summing it up: 'No more decisive rebuke could have been administered to the right-wing extremists . . . .'

Johnson did not conduct a campaign which sought to appease the right. On the contrary, his choice of a vice-presidential running mate identified with the left groupings within the Democratic Party, his own speeches emphasising his commitment to the search for peaceful co-existence, to eliminating segregation, to continuing domestic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislation in the New Deal tradition; these acts underlined the difference with Goldwaterism.

Of course the Goldwater gang conducted a campaign that reached a new low in tactics as well as content; and both are normally quite low in American politics. But this was the filthiest. The word of mouth and printed attacks upon the President were foul beyond belief. Towards the end of the campaign, printed forgeries and broadcast prevarications linked with the President (especially the 'call' for Negro voters to write in the name of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, and the distribution in millions of copies of Goebbels-like anti-Communist attacks), came not only from local lunatic-fringe groups but from the national headquarters of the Republican Party itself. But it was all in vain. Especially noteworthy is the fact that never has there been so much and so vile Red-baiting but this had less impact than it has had in the past two decades; Red-baiting *is losing its power as a significant political device in the United* States. Slander did not divert the people; anti-Communist propaganda did not divert the people; jingoism, chauvinism and racism did not divert the people. This does not mean these forms of poison had no effect; on the contrary, they did have effect and they are to be taken into account in helping to understand why twenty-six million Americans did vote for Goldwater. But it does mean that they did not divert the vast majority of the American people.

The landslide vote for Johnson did not come from the Democratic Party; the landslide vote came from the issues, *peace, civil rights,* and *advanced social legislation.* Johnson did not produce the landslide and his Party did not produce it. The people produced it for they were concerned with issues and they expressed a mandate not to a person and not to a label but to those issues. In this connection it is important to bear in mind that even Roosevelt—certainly the most popular political figure in the United States in the past century—did not make the New Deal. No, the New Deal made him; and it was the people—the workers creating the C.I.O., the unemployed in their multi-million organisations, the embattled farmers, the aroused youth and students, and the Negro masses—who made the New Deal and they made it through struggle around issues momentous to them.

The character of the vote shows all this very clearly. In what the *New York Times* (November 5, p. 34) calls 'the lower economic brackets' Johnson received 90 per cent of the vote (*i.e.*, 14 points more than Kennedy), while in the 'upper economic bracket' he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

received 48·2 per cent of the vote (this was also 14 points more than Kennedy received, reflecting the widespread fear of fascism and war). Among the Negro millions, Johnson's vote was practically unanimous: 95 per cent in the East, 95 per cent in the South, 96 per cent in the Midwest, and over 97 per cent in the Far West. Almost the same percentages apply to the Puerto Rican and the Mexican-American populations. This landslide victory, then, was the result of the central fact in this election: the organised labour movement was unanimously opposed to Goldwaterism; the Negro people were unanimously opposed to Goldwaterism.

Generally—and especially in the Presidential vote where so many issues were involved—the so-called 'white backlash' did not appear. On the contrary, among those groups where this phenomenon was supposed to be most likely—for instance, amongst Slavic-background workers—it simply did not appear. Furthermore, the Negro vote was massive and more numerous than ever before; it showed itself again, and more clearly than ever before, as a decisive element in United States politics. There was a marked increase in voting in the neighbourhoods of the workers and in the ghettoes, and the organised labour movement and Negro organisations played a central rôle, in getting out the vote and increasing registrations.

Generally speaking, the sophistication of the voters was high. They were voting on matters of principle and on issues, not on personalities. Where the more liberal candidate was a Republican—or where there was very little to choose one way or the other—Party lines were crossed. One of the most healthy aspects of the elections was the fact that within many State legislatures the most reactionary members have been defeated. And the same result appears in the Congress. Notoriously reactionary members of the House were defeated. There has not been so sweeping a political overturn, nationally, in over fifty years.

In the South where Goldwater ran openly as a racist candidate he did well. Where the electorate was fairly substantial—though still significantly disfranchised—Johnson won; this was true in most of the Southern states and almost all of the larger Southern cities. In the rural areas of South Carolina and Georgia and Louisiana—where brute force and terror keep Negroes (and many poorer whites) from the polls—Goldwater 'won,' but where considerable proportions of the Southern people—Negro and white—could vote, the Goldwater ticket lost. The Goldwater vote then, represents racism in the first place. It represents also inertia—that is, Goldwater was the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

candidate of the Republican Party and it is normal for several millions to vote Republican out of deep habit. Present, too, were the moods and feelings that produced a significant ultra-right; these include a sense of national humiliation which demagogic appeals to chauvinism and jingoism inflame; they include the sense of purposelessness and alienation, of despair and rot which are widespread and are part of the fundamental crisis in the American imperialist social order. But the vast majority of Americans displayed their basically healthy nature and in fact rejected reaction, fascism and war.

What now? Now comes the need to implement the mandate. Now the mass of the people must retain the initiative and must insist on the enactment of the programme for which they voted. And in Congress and in the State legislatures, the means exist to accomplish the mandate. But the votes in those bodies will not come automatically; they will come only on the basis of popular pressure. The initiative is in the hands of the masses. The right suffered a crushing defeat; the Republican party is split a dozen ways and is now engaged in internal warfare that probably will last for months if not years. The initiative must be seized and the moment grasped. Organisationally, the labour unanimity must be maintained and the Negro unanimity must be retained; and that Negro and labour unanimity must take the organisational form of Negro-labour unity. Each tended in the campaign to be against Goldwater unanimously—but separately; the point is to develop a Negro-labour unity for the achievement of common objectives. That the objectives are common was shown in practice in the elections; from that demonstration must flow the organic unity of these two great democratic and progressive forces in American life. With such unity, the *quality* of U.S. politics can be changed; with such unity one has the basis for a really democratic, progressive, anti-war and anti-monopoly political force in the United States. This will make certain a United States that is a force for peace and progress in the world.

In this election, the left played a more significant and more positive rôle than has been true in two decades. The left was more united than in many years; and the bulk of that left did participate within the mainstream of political life. The unity of that left must now be further strengthened, if it is to play an even more effective rôle in struggle to produce a peaceful U.S. foreign policy and a truly progressive U.S. domestic policy. But the unity must be one which makes the left *more* effective within the main arena of American life. The unity must be one which enhances the present dominant

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trend away from sectarianism and remoteness. The rôle of the left is most consequential. It will best analyse the mandate and it will most vigorously struggle for its implementation. It has the least vacillation and the most dedication of any of the elements in the coalition that swamped Goldwater. Some of those elements hope to thwart that implementation; some are in the coalition the better to *limit* the attainment of popular demands. Hence the key rôle of the left is that of the catalyst, organiser, and front-line participant.

The immediate demands arising out of the mandate are: *For Peace;* cease fire in Vietnam and negotiate; recognise Cuba; recognise the Chinese People's Republic and support her admission into the United Nations; extend the test-ban treaty to all forms of testing; press forward towards real disarmament; recognise the existence of two German States; prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons; and bring American soldiers back to America. *For Democracy and Well-Being;* As the other side of this policy of liquidating the Cold War, press forward advances on the home scene; fully enforce the civil rights law and all legislation requiring a termination of racist practices; democratise and develop education; pass modern legislation for the health of the people; eliminate slums through a massive multi-billion dollar federally supervised housing programme; extend social security provisions; adequately care for the aged; develop a massive public works and educational programme to make real inroads on unemployment; carry through the reapportionment programme as ordered by the Supreme Court so as to produce the needed democratisation of the political structure.

Meanwhile, with the repudiation of Red-baiting and anti-Communism that this election represented, a bold and confident effort towards eliminating anti-Communism from America—from its laws, its educational systems, its ideological and cultural life—is very much in order. The persecution of Communism is Goldwaterism; the McCarran and Smith Acts legalise Goldwaterism; such Star Chamber bodies as the House Un-American Activities Committee are instruments of Goldwaterism. Now that Goldwaterism has been rejected, all these implements of Goldwaterism must be thrown aside.

In 1964 the vast majority of the American people voted for peace, civil rights and social progress. Now—led by the organised labour movement and the organised movement for Negro freedom—this vast majority through struggle must implement their will.

CORRECTION: P. 510 (November issue), line 13. For 'value' read 'product'. This was an error in translation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A DAMNING EXPOSURE

[In the August 'Notes of the Month', Andrew Rothstein called attention to the negative attitude of Britain at the International Trade Conference at Geneva. With the publication of the full report now in Cmnd. 2417, our readers might like to have available for reference the texts of some of the recommendations, together with voting figures, showing how the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. voted.—Ed, L.M.]

1. Economic relations between countries, including trade relations, shall be based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality of states, self-determination of peoples, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

Voting: FOR 113, AGAINST 1 (U.S.A.), ABSTENTIONS 2 (including U.K.).

2. There shall be no discrimination on the basis of differences in socio-economic systems. Adaptation of trading methods shall be consistent with this principle.

Voting: FOR 96, AGAINST 3 (including U.S.A.), ABSTENTIONS 16 (including U.K.).

3. Every country has the sovereign right freely to trade with other countries, and freely dispose of its natural resources in the interest of the economic development and well-being of its own people.

Voting: FOR 94, AGAINST 4 (including U.K. and U.S.A.), ABSTENTIONS 18.

4. Economic development and social progress should be the common concern of the whole international community and should by increasing economic prosperity and well-being help strengthen peaceful relations and co-operation among nations. Accordingly, all countries pledge themselves to pursue internal and external economic policies designed to accelerate economic growth throughout the world. . . .

Voting: FOR 98, AGAINST 1 (U.S.A.), ABSTENTIONS 17 (including U.K.).

5. . . . Developed countries should assist the developing countries in their efforts to speed up their economic and social progress, should co-operate in measures taken by developing countries for diversifying their economies to this end.

Voting: FOR 97, AGAINST 0, ABSTENTIONS 19 (including U.K. and U.S.A.).

6. International institutions and developed countries should provide an increasing net flow of international financial, technical and economic assistance to support and reinforce, by supplementing the export earnings of developing countries, in their effort to accelerate their economic growth through diversification, industrialisation and increase of productivity on the basis of their national policies, plans and programmes of economic development. Such assistance should not be subject to any *political or military conditions*. This assistance, whatever its form and from whatever source, including foreign public and private loans and capital, should flow to developing countries on terms fully in keeping with their trade and development needs.

Voting: FOR 92, AGAINST 5 (including U.K. and U.S.A.), ABSTENTIONS 19.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND AFRICA

Jack Woddis

THE Labour Government has taken office at a time when important new problems face Africa. Direct colonial rule has been ended over most of the African continent, but in the remaining territories in Southern Africa the most stubborn resistance to ending white minority rule can be expected. For the independent African states, too, a new phase is opening out, that of defeating the counter-offensive of neo-colonialism, and carrying forward the victory of national independence into the new effort to uproot imperialism, win economic independence and bring a richer life to the peoples.

The Labour Government has a great opportunity to open a new page in our relations with Africa by abandoning the imperialist policies of the Tory Government, and offering sincere co-operation with the African people. The most vital interests of the British people are at stake, for our combined efforts, alongside those of the African people, can put the British monopoly firms down for the count, and so open up entirely new prospects for both our peoples.

One must appreciate, of course, that the Labour Government has inherited some very acute problems from the Tories. Everyone will welcome the speed with which the new Government, almost within hours of taking office, settled the question of the British South Africa (B.S.A.) Company by matching President Kaunda's offer of £2 million compensation with a £2 million offer of its own—and so taking the heat out of the crisis which had arisen on the very eve of Zambia's independence. This is specially welcome, since it was the 1950 Labour Government which signed the agreement on September 14, 1950, granting to the B.S.A. Company the right to 'continue in undisturbed enjoyment' of the mineral rights in Northern Rhodesia up until October 1, 1986. No one can argue that the £4 million now granted to the B.S.A. is insufficient compensation, seeing that in forty years the company received close on £135 million before tax (£70 million after tax) solely because of its alleged claim to dispose of mineral rights. It would have been simple justice if they had not received a penny more—but the 'undisturbed enjoyment' has been brought to an end, and that is the main thing. For the people of Zambia a bigger problem lies ahead, and that is how to stop the tens of millions of pounds profit being taken each year by the actual

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

copper companies, the Anglo-American and the Roan (late Rhodesian) Selection Trust groupings. If the new Zambia Government should, at any time, decide to take steps to curb or end this robbery, it should receive full support from the British Government.

As regards Southern Rhodesia, now renamed Rhodesia, the strong warning issued to Mr. Smith by Mr. Wilson on the consequences of a unilateral declaration of independence has been warmly welcomed by all progressive people. This public stand by the Labour Government has helped to clear the air. The holding of the farcical *Indaba* of African chiefs could, of course, fool no one. The 'referendum' taken among the European minority was equally an exposure of Smith, little over half the electorate voting 'Yes'. The public slapping down by Wilson of Smith is but the first step. Things cannot be left as they are. The status quo would mean leaving four million Africans under the rule of 270,000 Europeans. It would mean leaving 6 per cent of the population, the Europeans, in possession of 48 per cent of the land, and the best land at that. It would mean leaving the Africans in dire poverty, with an average wage of £6 a month (compared with £86 for Europeans), and a per capita income *per year* of only £3 in the African indigenous agriculture. It would mean retaining a franchise with income, property and educational qualifications that exclude all but a handful of Africans, an annual income of £120 a year being required even to get on the lowest category of the electoral roll. It has been rightly said of the Rhodesian franchise that 'a rough comparison would be a franchise in Britain open only to surtax payers'. And when one takes into account, too, that by the end of 1962 there were only 5,069 Africans in secondary school in Rhodesia, it is clear that even those who manage to squeeze through the needle's eye of the income qualifications would be hard put to it to pass the educational qualifications. And even after all that, it is only to vote for, at the most, fifteen African representatives in an Assembly of sixty-five.

The status quo in Rhodesia also means 5,000 political prisoners or detainees, the jailing of leaders such as Joshua Nkomo and the banning of his party. The African people want the present undemocratic constitution scrapped; the political prisoners released, and the calling of a conference, with the participation of all the political parties, to prepare a new constitution on a democratic basis, *i.e.*, on the basis of one man, one vote. This would be in line with the demands put forward by the majority of Commonwealth Premiers at their Conference earlier this year, and in line, too, with recom-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mendations of the United Nations, as well as decisions of the Organisation of African Unity and the Non-Alignment Conference held at Cairo in October. The Labour Government has an opportunity, and the responsibility, to follow up its first bold step in Rhodesia by actively intervening to end the present tyranny exercised by a handful of white settlers over four million Africans.

Further south, the Labour Government faces a number of serious problems in the High Commission Territories—Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland. All three stand in considerable danger of absorption by the Verwoerd Government. At present, much of their manpower is drained off to work on South African farms and in the mines, and their resources, such as the iron ore, asbestos and cellulose of Swaziland, is taken out to enrich the economies of South Africa, Britain and Japan. Constitutional change has been too slow, full democratic rights are not yet enjoyed, and the people's aspirations for independence and security are being thwarted. Political refugees from Verwoerd who have managed to reach High Commission Territories have not only been harrassed and restricted by the authorities, but in some cases deported or allowed to fall into the hands of the South African police. In Swaziland, British troops have been used to break strikes, and many workers have been arrested. The Labour Government now has the opportunity to end these Tory policies. Internal repression should be ended, essential constitutional changes speedily introduced in consultation with the representatives of the main organisations and parties of the people, and economic measures introduced to stop the drain of manpower and resources. Through co-operation with the independent African States, the British Government could make it possible for these Territories to gain independence without falling into Verwoerd's lap.

And then there is the major problem of South Africa. The detestation of the British labour movement towards the hated régime of Verwoerd has been expressed repeatedly. It is probably no exaggeration to say that, with the possible exception of Franco's government, the South African régime is more hated by the British labour movement than is any other régime in the world. There will be a warm welcome for the government's decision to ban arms to South Africa, and it is hoped that further steps along these lines will be taken.

On economic sanctions too, there is deep anxiety in the British labour movement and a desire that the Labour Government should act differently from its Tory predecessor. The organised workers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have already expressed their opinions at this year's T.U.C. at Blackpool, held shortly before the General Election. The following composite resolution based on those placed on the agenda by the Amalgamated Engineering Union and the Watermen, Lightermen, Tugmen and Bargemen's Union was adopted unanimously:

> This Congress condemns the vile system of apartheid in South Africa based on mass repression, large scale arrests, the banning and exile of national and trade union leaders, and the imprisonment of people without charge or trial, and calls on the British Government to implement a diplomatic, economic and arms boycott of South Africa in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly.
>
> It further calls on the General Council to use their influence to ensure that an international boycott of South African goods be carried out by organised workers until the South African Government concedes the principle of free speech and a franchise which allows all men and women to vote freely for their chosen representative to Parliament, and allows the African workers to organise trade unions and negotiate wage agreements and conditions.

Speaking in support of this resolution, Mr. Frank Cousins, on behalf of the Transport and General Workers' Union, declared: 'My members will turn their backs on the handling of ships at any time they are satisfied that this is what the working class section of Britain thinks they should do'. Backed by such strong feeling, the Labour Government would win wide support if it now instructed its U.N. representatives to vote in support of all resolutions and proposals which call for economic sanctions against Verwoerd.

Among the more interesting appointments made by Mr. Wilson was that of Mr. Anthony Greenwood as Secretary of State for the Colonies, and Mrs. Barbara Castle as Minister of Overseas Development, a new post. Both have been active in progressive causes associated with colonial and overseas questions, the former as Treasurer of the Movement for Colonial Freedom, and the latter as Chairman of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. The selection of Sir Hugh Foot (now Lord Caradon) as Britain's representative at the United Nations, has also aroused comment, in view of his earlier resignation from his U.N. post under the Tory Government, in protest against Government policy on Southern Rhodesia.

The Ministry of Overseas Development is of special interest, since it embraces the whole field of aid to developing countries, and could easily get snarled up in the more underhand manoeuvres of the neo-colonialist smoothies who have been operating for three years in the Department of Technical Co-operation, and who are now taken over by (or taking over) the new Ministry. This previous Department was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

directed by Sir Andrew Cohen, who has served British imperialism as head of the African Department at the Colonial Office, as Governor of Uganda, and as British representative on the Trusteeship Council at the United Nations. Sir Andrew remains as practical director under the new Ministry.

When the Department of Technical Co-operation was set up by the Tory Government in 1961, its main function was 'the provision of experts, administrators and the supply of advisory, technical and consultant services' to developing countries. In commenting on the setting up of the new department and the proposed appointment of Sir Andrew Cohen, with the simultaneous appointment of Sir Hugh Foot as Britain's spokesman on the U.N. Trusteeship Council, *The Times* (April 24, 1961) wrote:

> The colonial empire may shrink and the Commonwealth may change its form, but Britain's overseas responsibilities to the underdeveloped countries go on, changed but undiminished. These changes mean redeployment of manpower, not only at the bottom and in the middle ranges but at the top. And if Britain is to hold her place in the world, this redeployment is a matter for the exercise of the highest skill in fitting the man for the job.

And it then commented that 'No two men have played a greater part' (than Sir Andrew Cohen and Sir Hugh Foot) 'in their two ways in turning a now outdated colonial empire into an association of free peoples'. It is of significance that it has been boasted that the Department gets on well with Ministers of the developing states, since it 'does not have the taint of neo-colonialism'. The whole of this Department is now within the new Ministry of Overseas Development which will have the added function of responsibility for *financial* aid to developing countries, as well as continuing to provide technicians and advisers. No one would deny that there is need for financial and technical assistance to developing countries, but the antecedents of the new Ministry naturally give rise to misgivings.

The biggest help that the Labour Government could give the developing countries of Africa would be to take the British monopolies off their backs. As long as British companies dominate the economy of these countries, control their trade and possess their natural resources, the new Governments are terribly handicapped in trying to get their countries off the ground and build up their economies. A decisive break with Tory economic policies towards Africa would be of advantage both to Africa and to Britain. African economic growth demands African economic independence. The Labour Government will be judged by the people of Africa to the extent to which it assists them to reach these goals.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAIRO CONFERENCE DECLARATION

A Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries was held in Cairo in October. This Second Conference, at which 47 countries were represented and to which 11 other countries sent observers, undertook an analysis of the international situation with a view to making an effective contribution to the solution of major problems of concern to mankind. Excerpts from the text of some of the resolutions are printed below.

On the Congo: Deeply concerned at the rapidly deteriorating situation, we 'appeal to the Congolese Governments and all combatants to cease hostilities immediately and to seek . . . a solution permitting of national reconciliation . . . urgently appeal to all foreign powers at present interfering in the affairs of the Democratic Republic of Congo, particularly those engaged in military intervention in that country, to cease such interference which infringes the interests and sovereignty of the Congolese people and constitutes a threat to neighbouring countries'.

On Southern Rhodesia: It 'urges all States not to recognise the independence of Southern Rhodesia if proclaimed under the rule of the racist minority, and instead to give favourable consideration to according recognition to an African nationalist government in exile, should such a government be set up . . . and calls upon the United Kingdom to convene immediately a Constitutional Conference, to which all political groups in Southern Rhodesia would be invited for the purpose of preparing a new constitution based on the 'one man, one vote' principle, instituting universal suffrage and ensuring majority rule'.

On Apartheid: 'The Conference calls upon all States to boycott all South African goods and to refrain from exporting goods, especially arms, ammunition, oil and minerals to South Africa'.

On Peaceful Co-existence: 'Reaffirming their deep conviction that, in present circumstances, mankind must regard peaceful co-existence as the only way to strengthen world peace'.

On Disarmament: 'Urges the great Powers to take new and urgent steps towards achieving general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control . . . calls upon all States to accede to the Moscow treaty partially banning the testing of nuclear weapons . . . and urges extensions to include underground tests, and the discontinuance of such tests pending the extension of the agreement'. 'Appeals to the great Powers to abstain from all policies conducive to the dissemination of nuclear weapons and their by-products among those States which do not at present possess them. It underlines the great danger in the dissemination of nuclear weapons . . . and declare their own readiness not to produce, acquire or test any nuclear weapons, and call on all countries to enter into a similar undertaking and to take the necessary steps to prevent their territories, ports and airfields from being used by nuclear powers for the deployment or disposition of nuclear weapons. . . . The Conference reiterates its conviction that the existence of Military blocs, Great Power alliances and pacts arising therefrom has accentuated the cold war and heightened international tensions. The Non-Aligned Countries are therefore opposed to taking part in such pacts and alliances'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SMETHWICK—A WARNING AND A CALL TO ACTION

H. Bourne

WHAT took place in Smethwick to bring about the General Election result which shocked the whole labour movement? The events there and the attitude of the Tory head office to them, represent something new and significant in British politics.

Smethwick is a typically nineteenth century industrial town, merging without break into Birmingham and the Black Country. Its 68,000 population has declined from 84,000 thirty years ago, but its total housing has increased by 1,500. Four thousand Indian, Pakistan and West Indian immigrants (more than half women and children) live there, many employed on heavy unskilled work. In 1961 local immigration control committees appeared, which conducted a virulent campaign to help bring the Commonwealth Immigration Act into being. As soon as local public interest waned over one immigrant issue, another one was brought forward with full publicity. In April 1963, Alderman Griffiths, now Smethwick's M.P., called for the expulsion from Britain of all immigrants who had been unemployed for six months and warned that a public meeting to protest against this measure might lead to a racial riot.

In January 1964, a particularly vicious campaign, calling for separate classes for immigrant children spread fears as to the 'holding back' of other children's education. The Rev. C. F. Wilkinson, Vicar of St. Albans, was constrained to say: 'The Conservatives will not let the colour question be forgotten. They are constantly talking about it particularly before elections. Yet once you teach race hatred, it is very difficult to teach love'. Then in March came Mr. Griffiths's remarks about the 'nigger neighbour' slogan, 'I would not condemn anyone who said that', described by Harold Wilson as 'utterly squalid and degrading'.

The Conservative election campaign itself was described in the most scathing terms by *The Times* Midland correspondent (October 13). His report headed 'Vice—it's all in black and white', said:

> So Smethwick at last has come to this that the great issues of the day are all twisted and perverted by the question of colour and that slanders and verminous untruths . . . are here a considerable factor in the campaign . . . In the creation of this electoral atmosphere, the Conservative Party has played a leading part.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The campaign and result was condemned in wide quarters, including ten Smethwick clergymen and by individual Tories like Lord Boothby, 'It is disgusting . . . a racial fight in the worst traditions'. But the Tory press, uneasy at first, went over to injured innocence on Wilson's forthright condemnation of the Smethwick victor. There humility' (*The Times*, November 7).
is an effort to present him as 'a model blend of frankness, tact and

It is clear that in Smethwick has occurred the first instance of a Tory organisation officially employing the well-known fascist technique of inciting racial and colour prejudice through well-publicised slanders and inuendoes, keeping the racial pot boiling continually, and all under the guise of concern only for the people's housing, health and employment needs, allegedly menaced by the immigrant worker. In the midst of this confused and poisoned atmosphere, many Smethwick labour movement and other democratic bodies have fought valiantly against this poisoned and confused atmosphere. Public meetings, leaflets, a Trades Council Conference against racialism, sterling work by a Co-ordinating Committee against Discrimination and the immigrant workers organisations themselves—all have contributed to the fight against the spread of racialism. But the Tory campaign was conducted over a long period from vantage points in the Council and in the local press. It is possible too, that in some Labour circles there has been confusion on how to tackle the issue, and reluctance to grasp the colour nettle firmly.

A question of the greatest significance is whether this type of campaign is now to be the official policy of the Tory Party. All the evidence points to a serious development. The Tory decision to put through the Commonwealth Immigration Act showed the intent to utilise latent colour prejudice for their electoral purposes. No one can now deny that this Act is directed primarily against the coloured immigrants and all the agitation on its passage and renewal have inflamed these prejudices. Every Tory Conference since, has highlighted the immigration issue with increasing demands for still further measures. When the Conservative Head Office was asked in April 1963 by the Birmingham Area Co-ordinating Committee Against Racialism to repudiate the activities of the Smethwick Tories, it replied that the constituency associations were autonomous bodies and the protest 'should be sent to Smethwick'. Following the 'nigger neighbour' incident, Sir Alec Home was asked in Parliament

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to state clearly his attitude to campaigns like those waged by the Smethwick Conservatives. He replied: 'We would absolutely condemn racial discrimination in any form. . . .' However the Council seats gained by the Smethwick Tories in the last two years—against the general run, had not gone unnoticed. On August 7 this year, the *New Statesman* revealed that a meeting of Midland Conservative M.P.s and electoral officials had discussed electoral policy and reached agreement to make immigration one of the main planks of their election platform. Certain Midland M.P.s such as Edward Boyle, known to be in disagreement with the raising of this issue, were absent from the meeting. This was followed by an article in *The Spectator* (August 28, 1964) describing the Midland Tory statement as:

> comparatively mild in itself but immediately understood in the hysterical atmosphere being whipped up in Birmingham to give respectability to the views of Mr. Griffiths . . . what is significant is the fact that the Conservative Central Office has never publicly disowned Mr. Griffiths's views.

During the Election itself Sir Alec went out of his way to put fuel on the flames with his speech at Bradford (a city with 12,000 coloured immigrants) about the danger of 'a flood of perhaps one million immigrants'. Since the Election, the Tory press has justified the Smethwick tactics and used increasing virulence of language on the immigration issue.

The labour and broad democratic movement is thus faced with a new phenomenon which it will fail to overcome at its own peril. Important leading sections of the Tory Party believe that they can take the offensive and score electoral successes by the deliberate spread of racialism and that the severe economic and social problems of capitalist Britain will give them even more opportunity to make a 'scapegoat' of the immigrant population. The very term 'a flood of immigrants' is designed to stir the crudest fears and prejudices. To the racialist-minded, three West Indian faces in a bus or shopping street, are 'a flood'. For 150 years the British labour movement has been fighting from strength to strength to spread an independent working-class and Socialist consciousness to the great majority of the people, and teach the truth that the Tory leaders and monopoly capitalists are the central enemies of the people. Any division of race or colour which sidetracks the British worker from this understanding, can only perpetrate the gravest harm to the labour movement. The moment a trade unionist begins to talk against immigrant workers, the rot creeps into his trade union principles, for how can

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there be first and second class trade unionists? To the extent that a Labour supporter turns his anger and frustration at capitalism's evils on to the 'sins' of his coloured brother, to that degree is his anti-Tory resolve weakened. What could be clearer and more serious proof of this than the Labour loss of Smethwick?

Of course there are a host of problems concerned with the economic and social integration of immigrant workers into the British community. A great amount of constructive and painstaking work has already been done by many official and voluntary bodies on these questions and it is clear that very much more needs to be done. But it must be freed from all racial and political exploitation and publicity in order that its efforts can achieve the positive results that are shown in the older established multi-racial centres such as Cardiff and Liverpool. The central problem to be faced here is racialism and it must be fought as such. The first essential is to extinguish the fire-raising centres and deal with the arsonists. The long awaited Bill against racial incitement and discrimination has to be passed through with utmost urgency. Fascist organisations must now be firmly outlawed.

With this, must now come a real onslaught on racial prejudice and discrimination, launched from every section of our public life. The Government itself should set the example, utilising all means of mass education to pillory the lies and slanders about the immigrant workers. Let it repeal the vicious Immigration Act which has provided so much fuel for the racialists. Draw in the local authorities and all public bodies to prepare and carry into effect a comprehensive national scheme for the most rapid integration of the immigrant communities into British society.

No city with an immigrant population can now remain without its form of Council for Racial Integration, operating energetically to overcome prejudice and discrimination. Reinforce the appeal to elementary social justice and humanity with the facts of Britain's real position in the world, which imperatively demands the closest economic and social friendship with the coloured peoples' three-quarters of the world. In this context, it now becomes still more urgent to bring all British colonial wars to an end as in Aden and Malaysia.

All credit must be given for excellent work by many labour movement bodies but it is clearly inadequate in scale and impetus to the size of the problems. The T.U.C. should call on all unions to conduct a campaign of enlightenment amongst all their members and bring

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the immigrant workers fully into trade union life. Wherever trade union effort has been made, the result has been the strengthening of the movement by a big influx of staunch and loyal trade union members from the immigrants. Every Socialist should now regard it as a matter of principle to take a personal initiative boldly to combat prejudice and discrimination in their own factory, organisation, club and neighbourhood. This direct attack on racialism cannot be avoided. It must be bold, hard hitting, uncompromising and carried through to victory. Of course, the basic foundation of the fight must always be the increased struggle of the labour movement to win the people's demands and advance to Socialist power. If the movement fails to provide the real answer against the real enemy, Tory and Fascist demagogy will soon provide a false answer against a false enemy. Hence, the spread of racialism is also a warning signal for the whole movement at all levels to advance its whole class and Socialist aims.

Tremendous progressive changes are taking place in the modern world. The old imperialist system of colonial slavery, from which stems the man-hating poison of racialism, is seeing its last years. Even in the U.S.A., the heartland of racialism, the popular forces have just won a vital advance with the defeat of Goldwater. It is unthinkable that our own country, with its proud tradition of struggle for freedom, should not now rouse itself to root out racialism from its public life. The overwhelming majority of our people will welcome and support this fight. With determination and the sustained offensive, it will be won.

BOOK REVIEWS

Economics for Trade Unionists

S. Aaronovitch

Lawrence & Wishart. 98 pp. 5s.

THIS BOOK IS A MUST for all trade unionists whether they have just joined the ranks, or are established shop stewards or officials. The first part explains, in language all can readily understand, the theory of surplus value, destroying completely one's schoolday impressions that all profits were made from 'buying cheap and selling dear'.

The chapters dealing with systems of wage payments, not only describe with great clarity the various incentive schemes and the manner in which they increase the 'normal' exploitation, but also debunk the widely held belief (even amongst those who should know better) that there is some scientific basis for the price offered the unsuspecting employee for his labour. 'Mumbo-jumbo' was never more aptly applied than to the language of the Time Study engineer. The knowledge gained from this chapter will certainly enable the shop steward to speak to the rate fixer in his own language, knowing full well that he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not trying to obtain anything more than that to which he is entitled.

The author deals with the current and highly controversial subject of an Incomes Policy. He examines one of the many contradictions of capitalism: the desire on the one hand to restrain wages whilst on the other hand a growing purchasing power of the workers is needed in order to purchase the goods produced. He shows the need to fight on two fronts: to establish socialism, whilst improving wages, conditions and hours of work under capitalism. The shop steward or official who neglects the day by day fight on wages, etc., will quickly be cast aside by the membership. He may be accused of maintaining the tiger he wishes to kill. This is particularly true of automation, for until we have a government which will introduce a national plan, such as the 'Plan for Engineering', trade unionists have to deal with effects not causes. Dealing with automation, the author is at his best explaining the need to fight for shorter hours, increased wages, improved holidays, pensions, etc. These are not an end in themselves, but a means of offsetting the worst effects of automation whilst private ownership remains, and preparing the way for social ownership.

With detailed analysis, he leads his readers in the concluding pages to the realisation that the full effects and benefits of the technical revolution can never be obtained whilst the means of production remain in private hands.

HUGH SCANLON.

Clifford Allen

Arthur Marwick
Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1964.
220 pp. 30s.

FROM HIS rising as a Labour luminary, Ramsay MacDonald for thirty years rolled across the political skies from left to right: and in his wake went lesser luminaries, amongst them one whom he made Lord Allen of Hurtwood. Allen had begun his career as secretary to a committee for carrying through MacDonald's darling project of a daily paper devoted to the Labour Party. He led the formation of the University Socialist Federation in 1912 and was its chairman till 1915. But his rise to fame was due to his chairmanship (1914-18) of the No-Conscription Fellowship of which Fenner Brockway was secretary. From 1916 to 1918 he thrice suffered imprisonment and came out with impaired health. Working closely with Ramsay MacDonald in 1921-22, he became treasurer and chairman of the Independent Labour Party from 1922 to 1926: when he resigned because of its left wing led by James Maxton. Latterly Allen became one of 'the men of Munich' and was warmly thanked for his efforts by Neville Chamberlain and Lord Halifax. Allen was a skilful administrator, an ingenious organiser and an outstanding practitioner of chamber oratory. He exerted a charm on audiences, and even in casual encounters. Twenty years after his death Allen captivated the author of this biography, which, though painstakingly and competently compiled, is nevertheless another example of hero-worship.

Why was it not written earlier by someone who knew Lord Allen personally? The answer is that any such biography might well have been inhibited. It could, however, be written more easily in these last few years in the climate of attempts at rehabilitation of 'the Men of Munich'.

P.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN EVENTFUL YEAR

IN our last issue of 1964, it is worthwhile to look back on what has certainly been an eventful year.

From our Editor's brilliant Notes 'After Kennedy' in January, to the pertinent 'Labour Government and Africa' in the current issue, *Labour Monthly* has dealt with subjects affecting the lives and jobs of people in almost every country in the world. We are fortunate in having the services of writers who combine a wealth of experience of contemporary problems with historical understanding, and whose specialist abilities are second to none, and the wide platform of opinion in *L.M.* makes a strong appeal to all sections of progressive thought.

A similar survey of the year's Fund gives us both pride and anxiety. Pride because every month there are new names to add to our steadfast 'regulars', whose constant support is the backbone of our finance, and anxiety because sometimes fewer of our friends are able to send donations, and we suffer accordingly.

Nevertheless, it is satisfying to notice the steadily increasing number of readers whose gifts help us to complete the job started by our team of writers and enable us to reach more people each month. 'The main objective is achieved', writes a London reader, 'The Tories are OUT. Now, more than ever, we have to rally all Labour supporters behind a progressive policy on all fronts.' The hundreds of friends who showed their appreciation in the most practical way in 1964 will see the implication for *L.M.* in this struggle in 1965.

Helen Falber

£75 16s. 7d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: H. Brindle, 5s; H.L. (U.S.A.), £5; Marie Philibert, 15s; B. W. Mackay, 7s 6d; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; Southend Branch, 17s 6d; D. J. Perry, 2s 6d; 'S. Mill', £1; 'In memory of Joe Brien', 3s; Ben Ainley, 10s; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; 'Stockport Santa', 10s; 'The Butcher Family', 10s; A. Corbett, £1; S. Townsend, 12s 6d; 'G.I.', 2s; F.G.A., £1; R.F.B., £3; Humphrey's Family, 10s; Les Bates, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 3s; Oldham Branch, 2s; Two Tynesiders, 5s 6d; L'Humanité, 5s; M. Illing, £2; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; R. McLeod, 5s; R. Dodd, £1; Nellie Usher, 2s 6d; J. E. Atkinson, 8s 6d; 'Pax', 5s; E. Sheldon, 10s; J. Tarver, 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: S.D., £15; M. Alexander, 10s; E. Walsh, 16s; H. Swanson, 9s 6d; M.H. (Canada), 6s; F. W. Garley, 9s; H. Wolff, 19s; W. and N. Cockren, £1 1s; J. Platts-Mills, £1 1s; D. G. Varnfield, 9s; P. T. Regester, £1; G.J.G., 4s; J. Walkinshaw, 10s; S. Carr, 5s; D. Hogg, 1s 6d; E. J. Wright, 9s; G. S. Robertson, 9s; E. M. Berlyn, 7s; R. Wrightson, £3 19s; D. R. Morrison, 10s 6d; A. A. Woolf, 4s 6d; W. Chester, 1s 6d; A. Robins, 19s; Trude Hughes (In appreciation of 'Sancho Panza's Last Will'), 10s; 'Ph.D.', 5s; G. Cameron, 19s; J. V. Ruffell, 9s; Len Goldman, 16s; H. Fisher, 10s; Mary Eckersley (In memory of W. Eckersley), £10; H. Ullyatt, 10s; 'An American Friend', £2 10s; Finchley C.N.D., 10s; H.B. (Canada), £1 16s; W. J. Fairman, 1s; G. Chambers, 10s; W.M. (Canada), 8s 6d; M. Shapiro, 9s;

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Index to Volume XLVI

I—AUTHORS

		Page
APTHEKER, Dr. Herbert	Goldwaterism	402
	The United States Election	554
ARNOT, R. Page	Lenin's Works (R)	90
	Union Law: A Practical Step	300
	The Outbreak of War 1914	369
	'Tis Sixty Years Since (R)	476
P.A.	Clifford Allen (R)	571
A.B.	The Radical Tradition (R)	238
BERGER, John	1914-1964 (Poem)	374
BERNAL, Professor J. D.	The Brain Drain	178
BERNSTEIN, Hilda	The Politics of Torture	518
BONNAR, Robert	Our Nationalised Railways	255
	Wife of the Prisoner (R)	333
BOURNE, Harry	Colour Bar: Enemy of the Labour Movement	27
	Smethwick: A Warning	566
BOWMAN, D.	The Right to Strike	207
BRIDGEMAN, Reginald	The National Liberation Struggle	466
BROWN, Alan	A Swindler's Prospectus	59
	The South East and Forced Migration	225
	The Corrupted Giant (R)	383
	Stewartie (R)	479
BUNTING, Brian	Africa: The Way Ahead (R)	45
BURCHETT, Wilfred	The Future of South Vietnam	357
BURT, Les	The Greater London Council	186
CAMPBELL, J. R.	Neither Socialist Nor Democratic	109
CASTRO, Fidel	Cuba: Five Years of Progress	117
CHATER, Dr. Tony	Aid and Trade for Underdeveloped Countries	272
	Science, Socialism and Harold Wilson	414
CORNWELL, D. H.	Youth Employment	380
COX, Idris	Consciencism (R)	285
	Industrial Growth and World Trade (R)	431
	Southern Rhodesia: Face-saving Formulas	470
	Economic Transition in Africa (R) / Africa and the United Nations (R)	527
DELEGATE	Engineers' Conference Highlights	259
DOUGHTY, George	Trade Unions and the Law	205
DUNMAN, Jack	Beef Crisis and Agricultural Policy	330
DUTT, Clemens	World Questions: A Study Guide (R) / Political Theory (R)	191
	Party and Society (R)	334
	Karl Marx: Early Writings (R)	478
DUTT, R. Palme	Notes of the Month: After Kennedy	1
	Notes of the Month: Labour and Arms	49
	Notes of the Month: Requiem for the Herald	97
	Notes of the Month: Election Strategy	145
	Notes of the Month: Election Portents	193
	Notes of the Month: A Jingo Election?	241
	Notes of the Month: Fifty Years After	337
	Notes of the Month: Trade Unions and the Election	385
	Notes of the Month: How to Vote	433
	Notes of the Month: New Horizons	481
	Notes of the Month: Problems and Perspective	529
	Jawaharlal Nehru: A Tribute	319
EATON, John	Steel and the Nation	22
	The Unresolved Dilemma	323
ELLIOTT, Lon	Spain, 1936-1939 (R)	95
ELVIN, George	Films: The Lion's Tale	113
ENISAH, C.	Nationalism and Oil Profits	139
	Arab World and Socialism	375
EWER, W. N.	Five Souls (Poem)	354
FALBER, Helen	A Magazine of Ideas	96
	Far and Wide	144
	A Sense of Values	192
	New Friends	240
	Just Ask For It	288
	Summer Call	336
	History As It Should be Taught	384
	In Time of Crisis	432
	Battle Cries	480
	Practical Steps	528
	An Eventful Year	572

(R) stands for Review throughout

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
FORMAN, Stan.	Lenin on Cinema	523
FRENCH, S.	Land: What Must Be Done	454
GALLACHER, William	'Purpose' and Mr. Wilson (R)	227
GREEN, Nan	Whither Latin America? (R)	191
K.H.	The Forest (R)	142
HARMEL, Michael	High Drama in Pretoria...	277
HART, Finlay	The Boilermakers' Conference	328
HUBBARD, Jocelyn	British Guiana: The Answer to Race	428
HUTCHINS, S. G.	The First International	410
HUTT, Allen	The Press in Election Year	126
	A History of British Trade Unions Since 1889, Vol. 1. (R) ...	526
IBARRURI, Dolores	New Trends in Catholic Church	494
JACKSON, T. A.	Marx and Shakespeare	165
KERRIGAN, Peter	Trade Unions and the Labour Government	548
KITSON, Alex	Trade Unions and the Law	355
KUCZYNSKI, Jurgen	Population Theories and Marxism (R)	232
LABOUR MONTHLY	'Justice'	26
	Zanzibar	88
	'Encounter' and Labour Monthly	89
	British Political Facts, 1900-60 (R)	238
	The Foreign Agent: Truth and Fiction (R)	287
	A Seventy-Fifth Anniversary	322
	The Shadow of a Handshake	504
	The Voice of the Pioneers	553
LAMBERT, David	Trade Unions and the Law	356
LAUCHLAN, W.	Socialist Nationalisation	447
LENIN, V. I.	Unpublished Lenin Letter	184
	Historic Document	283
	Lenin on Cinema	524
LIBERMAN, Prof. Yevsei	The Soviet Interpretation of Profit	510
I.M.	The Rise of the South African Reich (R)	527
MARSHAK, Samuel	Shakespeare Seen From Moscow	310
MARTINDALL, R.	Trade Union Education: The End of a Chapter	474
MAY, Stanley V.	The Builders Meet	379
MOFFATT, Abe	White Papers, or Real Plans?	19
MONTAGU, Ivor	History Re-wrote	68
	Cyprus and South Vietnam	174
	The Warren Report	499
MORTIMER, J. E.	No Socialism Without Public Ownership	399
	Incomes Policy and the Unions	543
NANDY, Dipak	Immigrants and the Election	449
NEWTON, J. E.	Trade Unions and the Law	356
NIVEN, Barbara	Corker's Freedom (R)	286
'OBSERVER'	West German Police State	281
PEFKOS, George	Cyprus: Self-Determination	80
POMEROY, William	The Philippines: Neo-Colonialism and Nationalism ...	40
PRITT, Q.C., D. N.	The Courts and the Trade Unions	130
	British Government Observed (R)	238
	British Guiana: Colonialist Bad Faith at its Worst ...	268
	Korea: Dead Myths Revived	302
	Political Adventure (R)	382
	Cyprus: More Colonialist Misbehaviour	419
	What's In a Name (Poem)	457
	Problems of the New Labour Government	495
QUAESTOR	Peace Problems 1964	63
	Who Helped Hitler? (R)	218
	Multilateral Nuclear Force	364
A.R.	London Landmarks (R)...	143
RASHID, Salim	First Declaration of Zanzibar	209
ROTHSTEIN, Andrew	Soviet Trade Unions at Work	32
	Election Issues Sharpen (Notes)	289
	Reflections on the October Revolution	512
RUSSELL, Sam	France: United Action	76
SCANLON, Hugh	Economics for Trade Unionists (R)	570
SHANLEY, J. R.	Trade Unionists and Automation	159
	Socialism: Utopian and Scientific (R)	287
	Trade Union Education	515
SLOAN, Pat	History of the U.S.S.R. (R)	333
STEWART, R.	Lenin's Funeral	16
TUCKETT, Angela	Facing Upwards	47
	Safeguard Union Rights	262
	Where Thaelmann Died—and Lives (Poem)	363
WATEN, Judah	Australia After the Elections	84
WILLIAMSON, John	Whither America Under Johnson?	36
WINTERTON, E. M.	T.U.C., The Election and Class Struggle	458
WODDIS, Jack	Reflections on East Africa	134
	End the Farce in Southern Rhodesia	314
	The Return of Tshombe	423
	The Labour Government and Africa	560

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II—SUBJECTS

		Page
AFRICA	Reflections on East Africa	134
	First Declaration of Zanzibar	209
	End the Farce in Southern Rhodesia	314
	The Return of Tshombe	423
	Southern Rhodesia: Face-saving Formulas	470
	The Labour Government and Africa	560
AGRICULTURE	Beef Crisis and Agricultural Policy	330
AUSTRALIA	Australia After the Elections	84
BRITISH GUIANA	Colonialist Bad Faith at its Worst	268
	British Guiana: The Answer to Race	428
CONSERVATIVE PARTY	A Swindler's Prospectus	59
CUBA	Cuba: Five Years of Progress	117
CYPRUS	Cyprus: Self-Determination	80
	Cyprus: More Colonialist Misbehaviour	419
DOCUMENTS	Historic Document	283
	Marx and the Working Class Press	418
	A Damning Exposure	559
	Cairo Conference Declaration	565
ECONOMIC SITUATION AND COMMON MARKET	Neither Socialist Nor Democratic	109
	Aid and Trade for Underdeveloped Countries	272
	The Unresolved Dilemma	323
EGYPT	Arab World and Socialism	375
ELECTIONS	Election Strategy (Notes)	145
	Greater London Council	186
	Election Portents (Notes)	193
	A Jingo Election (Notes)	241
	Election Issues Sharpen (Notes)	289
	How to Vote (Notes)	433
	Socialist Nationalisation	447
	Immigrants and the Election	449
	Land: What Must be Done	454
	T.U.C.: The Election and Class Struggle	458
FASCISM	History Re-wrote	68
	Who Helped Hitler? (R)	218
	Ernst Thaelmann (20th Anniversary of his Murder)	362
FILMS	Films: The Lion's Tale	113
	Lenin on Cinema	524
FRANCE	France: United Action	76
KOREA	Dead Myths Revived	302
LABOUR MOVEMENT	Colour Bar: Enemy of the Labour Movement	27
	Labour and Arms (Notes)	49
	'Purpose' and Mr. Wilson	227
	No Socialism Without Public Ownership	399
	Science, Socialism and Harold Wilson	414
	Socialist Nationalisation	447
	New Horizons (Notes)	481
	Problems of the New Labour Government	495
	Problems and Perspective (Notes)	529
	Incomes Policy and the Unions	543
	Trade Unions and the Labour Government	548
	Labour Government and Africa	560
LAND	Land: What Must Be Done	454
LENIN	Lenin's Funeral	16
	Lenin's Works	90
	Unpublished Lenin Letters	184
	Historic Document	283
	'Tis Sixty Years Since	476
	Lenin on Cinema	523
NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT	The National Liberation Struggle	466
OBITUARIES	Lazar Zaidman	94
	Jawaharlal Nehru—a Tribute	319
	Samuel Marshak	378
	Joan Beauchamp	446
	Salme A. Dutt	465
	Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	473
OIL	Nationalism and Oil Profits	139
PHILIPPINES	The Philippines: Neo-Colonialism and Nationalism	40
POETRY	Five Souls	354
	1914–1964	374
	Where Thaelmann Died—And Lives	363
	What's In a Name	457
	Last Will	465
POPULATION	The South East and Forced Migration	225
	Population Theories and Marxism	232
PRESS	Requiem for the Herald (Notes)	97
	The Press in Election Year	126
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION	Colour Bar: Enemy of the Labour Movement	27
	Smethwick: A Warning	566
RAILWAYS	Our Nationalised Railways	255
SCIENCE	The Brain Drain	178

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		Page
SHAKESPEARE	Marx and Shakespeare	165
	Honour to William Shakespeare 1564-1964	168–9
	Shakespeare Seen From Moscow	310
SOUTH AFRICA	High Drama in Pretoria	277
	The Politics of Torture	518
STEEL	Steel and the Nation	22
TRADE UNIONISM	White Papers, or Real Plans?	19
in the Sixties, Problems of	The Courts and the Trade Unions	130
	Trade Unionists and Automation	159
	Trade Unions and the Law	205 and 355
	The Right to Strike	207
	Our Nationalised Railways	255
	Engineers' Conference Highlights	259
	Safeguard Union Rights	262
	Union Law: A Practical Step	300
	The Boilermakers' Conference	328
	The Builders Meet	379
	Trade Unions and the Election (Notes)	385
	T.U.C., The Election and Class Struggle	458
	Trade Union Education: The End of a Chapter	474
	Trade Union Education: An End or a Beginning?	515
	Incomes Policy and the Unions	543
	Trade Unions and the Labour Government	548
U.S.A.	After Kennedy (Notes)	1
	Whither America Under Johnson?	36
	Goldwaterism	402
	The Warren Report	499
	The United States Elections	554
U.S.S.R.	Soviet Trade Unions at Work	32
	The Shadow of a Handshake	504
	The Soviet Interpretation of Profit	510
	Reflections on the October Revolution	512
VIETNAM	The Future of South Vietnam	357
WAR OR PEACE	Peace Problems 1964	63
	Cyprus and South Vietnam: The Precariousness of Peace	174
	Who Helped Hitler? (R)	218
	Fifty Years After (Notes)	337
	Multilateral Nuclear Force	364
	The Outbreak of War 1914	369
WEST GERMANY	West German Police State	281
YOUTH	Youth Employment	380

Books Reviewed

Author or Editor	Title (and Reviewer)	Page
Aaronovitch, S.	Economics for Trade Unionists (Hugh Scanlon)	570
Alford, Robert R.	Party and Society (Clemens Dutt)	334
Aragon, Louis	History of the U.S.S.R. (Pat Sloan)	333
Berger, John	Corker's Freedom (Barbara Niven)	286
Bonnar, Robert	Stewartie (Alan Brown)	479
Bottomore, T. B.	Karl Marx: Early Writings (Clemens Dutt)	478
Bunting, Brian	The Rise of the South African Reich (I.M.)	527
Butler, David and Freeman, Jennie	British Political Facts 1900-1960 (L.M.)	238
Chapman, Brian	British Government Observed (D. N. Pritt)	238
Clegg, H. A.	A History of the British Trade Unions Since 1889, Vol. 1. (Allen Hutt)	526
Communist Party	London Landmarks (A.R.)	143
Engels, Frederick	Socialism, Utopian and Scientific (J. R. Shanley)	287
Field, G. C.	'Political Theory'; (Clemens Dutt)	191
Fuentes, Carlos	Whither Latin America (Nan Green)	191
Halsey, Margaret	The Corrupted Giant (Alan Brown)	383
Horskowits and Harwitz (Editors)	Economic Transition in Africa (Idris Cox)	527
Hovet, Thomas, Jnr.	Africa and the United Nations (Idris Cox)	527
Johnson, Oakley C.,	Foreign Agent: Truth and Fiction (L.M.)	287
Kilmuir, Earl of	Political Adventure (D. N. Pritt)	382
Leff, Vera	Wife of the Prisoner (Robert Bonnar)	333
Lenin, V. I.	Collected Works (R. Page Arnot) Vols 1–7	90
	„ 8–13	476
Maisky, Ivan	Who Helped Hitler? (Quaestor)	218
Maizels, A.	Industrial Growth and World Trade (Idris Cox)	431
Marwick, Arthur	Clifford Allen (P.A.)	571
Mennell, William	The British Economy (W. Gallacher)	227
Nkrumah, Kwame	Consciencism (Idris Cox)	285
Osborn, Fairfield	Our Crowded Planet (J. Kuczynski)	232
Pomeroy, William J.	The Forest (K.H.)	142
Sandoval, J. and Azcarate, M.	Spain, 1936–1939 (Lon Elliott)	95
Tawney, R. H.	The Radical Tradition (A.B.)	238
United World Trust	World Questions: A Study Guide (Clemens Dutt)	191
Wilson, Harold	Purpose in Politics (W. Gallacher)	228
Woddis, Jack	Africa: The Way Ahead (Brian Bunting)	45

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

—and it's cheaper too!

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s., Canada and USA, $3.50), for year's subscription from the .....issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Things change quickly in the Soviet Union

and it's easy to get out of touch about the latest space shot or the newest bid for peace.

For the widest coverage of Soviet affairs, read the well-illustrated

SOVIET WEEKLY

3d. Thursdays 8/- 6 mths. 15/- 12 mths.

Bookshops or direct from
SOVIET WEEKLY (LM)
3, ROSARY GARDENS,
LONDON, S.W.7

Binder Bros. Ltd.
Building and decorating
by craftsmen
TOTtenham 2362

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.
THE COUNTRY STANDARD
Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.
THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH
'Economic League Leaders'
'Port Employers' Profits'
1s. or 1s. 2½d. by post
Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

MIMETTE FURS LTD.
Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.
117, High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
'Phone CROydon 4328

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class. Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: PRO 7254. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Liffords Pl., S.W.13

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Internationale

R. Palme Dutt

The international socialist movement from the Communist Manifesto to the present day

36s.

The Central Labour College, 1909-29

W. W. Craik

The famous Ruskin College "strike" and the remarkable development in working-class education which it initiated

30s.

Precapitalist Economic Formations

Karl Marx, ed. and Introd. **E. J. Hobsbawm**

First English translation of Marx's study of world economic development; with full Introduction based on recent discussions among Marxist historians

25s.

Documents of the First International, 1866-68

The Minutes of the General Council—records "full of working-class history, from policy debates to difficulties in raising money," as a reviewer said of Vol. I (1864-66)

21s.

The Foreign Policy of the Soviet State

V. I. Lenin

A collection showing the documentary evidence of Lenin's views on relations between socialist and capitalist states

7s. 6d.

Questions of the Socialist Organisation of the Economy

V. I. Lenin

Lenin on a wide variety of aspects of an immensely important subject—nationalisation, workers' control, management in industry, etc.

7s. 6d.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED